

REMARKS

In furtherance of the obviousness type rejection of claims 1, The Examiner has cited US references Eng and Wolf (described in detail in previous communications) in view of Patent Application 2004/0114607 to Shay. Firstly, the Applicants believe that the Examiner has inappropriately cited the Shay reference in combination with both the Eng and Wolf references for at least the following. Shay is specifically directed at a switched packet network and more particularly “sending a multiplicity of packets at irregular intervals a minimum network transit delay can be determined by each of the receive nodes...”, whereas Eng and Wolf are both directed at systems based upon point to point serial data transfer. For example, the Wolf reference (discussed at length in the previous responses) is specifically directed at a DVI system that is based upon Transition Minimized Differential Signaling (TMDS) that carries video, audio, and auxiliary data via one of three modes called the *Video Data Period*, the *Data Island Period*, and the *Control Period*. During the Video Data Period, the pixels of an active video line are transmitted. During the Data Island period (which occurs during the horizontal and vertical blanking intervals), audio and auxiliary data are transmitted within a series of packets. The Control Period occurs between Video and Data Island periods. Therefore, one cannot realistically combine the switched packet system described in Shay with the system described in Wolf (or Eng for that matter).

The invention as recited in claim 1 specifically requires that while the multi-media data packets having the reduced size data packet header are from the source device to the display, information associated with the streaming is passed between the source device and the display by way of the auxiliary channel concurrent with the streaming. Therefore, there is no need to wait for “data islands” to send information related to the data stream, such as control information. Furthermore, in contrast to Shay, the invention does not teach or suggest “timing packets”.

The Applicants believe that claims 1, 7, and 13 and all claims depending thereon are neither suggested nor rendered obvious by any of the cited references taken separately or in any combination thereof.

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
(408) 255-8001